

ST. CLEMENT'S.

Continued from the First Page. Each action was sent to me, and the information came from a person not known to the vestry.

MUCH OF THE DIFFICULTY

which exists in the minds of those gentlemen has grown out of an absence of any clear and distinct statement of what was, or was not, taught at St. Clement's, or of what part of the teaching or ritual they, on their part, objected to. I have been in part to blame for this, and hope it is now remedied by the following paper.

Bowings, prostrations, and genuflections to the altar have never been taught. References for the places and things made sacred by holy use is taught and, I hope, practised.

I wish it distinctly to be understood that neither the clergy of St. Clement's Church has ever taken one word on

THE SUBJECT OF CONFESION

other than that contemplated by the "Exhortation to the Holy Communion," and as taught and practised by the Roman Church, has by long usage confined the term, "artificial confession," to a technical confession. It is by this term these gentlemen mean the use of confession as taught and practised by the Church of Rome, I emphatically deny the teaching or practice of any such custom. The Roman Church says, "you must." The Anglican Church says, "you may."

But, to the "troubled minds contemplated by the exhortation to the communion;" those with an "oppressed conscience" seek relief in that way, the Church has always counselled and encouraged confession as a means to "quiet the grief," and for the "removal of all scruple and doubtfulness."

The Bishop says in effect that the "whole drift" of Hooker's teaching is

AGAINST PRIVATE CONFESION.

What, then, is Hooker's meaning, when he says in Book vi, chap. lv, 7:—"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left in His Church, \* \* \* spiritual and ghostly physicians, guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular cure of diseased minds."

The quotation from Bishop Jewel's "Apology" is entirely foreign to the subject.

Bishop Jewel speaking of the subject as taught and practised in the Church of Rome. When he speaks of the practice of the Church of England we get at his teaching on the subject under discussion.

IN THE HOMILY ON REPENTANCE.

In arguing against the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome, he says, "That every man should be bound to their (i. e. the Roman) artificial confession, it is no commandment or ordinance of God." So say I.

This same Bishop Jewel, in his defense of the Apology, says—"Touching the third (private) confession, made unto our brother, 'if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprov'd. The abuses and errors are not in the confession, but in the confession that is made to a private confessor than a private sermon."

The quotation from Bishop Jewel, used by Bishop Stevens, is foreign to the question under discussion. Used as he uses it, he makes Bishop Jewel say what he does not say.

THE FACTS IN THE CASE

I may perhaps be allowed to rehearse. The whole subject of ritual, doctrine, and practice had been discussed in vestry meeting upon many occasions previous to the meeting of January 15, 1871. At that meeting, for a second time, I expressed my willingness to abandon any practices in matters of ritual which the vestry would say were detrimental to the interests of the parish, or which, in the opinion of the vestry, might be a cause of scandal to the Church at large.

All the points in the ritual in St. Clement's Church were discussed or enumerated, and not one member of the vestry raised a word of objection to a single point.

I then announced that, in the future, should I be called upon, I would consult the wardens before making it.

(I add, by way of parenthesis, that on Tuesday evening of the week previous to the 13th of January, 1871, Mr. George N. Allen and Mr. John Lawrence, of my house, and expressed their satisfaction with my proposition, and their readiness to defend the services as at that time conducted.)

I beg leave to call attention to the fact, that at a meeting of the vestry, held on the 18th day of January, a resolution was offered to the effect that the whole matter be referred to the Bishop.

REFERRED TO THE BISHOP

and Standing Committee. This resolution was unanimously tabled, or postponed, the mover of it not voting.

I come now to the meeting of January the 15th, 1871.

At that meeting, after my statement, before alluded to, it was unanimously resolved that "the whole matter be referred to the rector and the rector's warden," as a committee who were to investigate the whole subject and

REPORT TO THE VESTRY.

This committee, of which I was chairman, held a meeting. No conclusion was reached. The first draft of the paper spoken of by the Bishop, as marked "M," was read and discussed.

I then prepared a paper, which was substantially the same as that spoken of by the Bishop as marked "B."

These papers were simply expressions of opinion by the two members of the committee, preparatory to a final report by that committee to the vestry.

These two papers passed into the hands of Mr. Morris. He then presented a letter to the Bishop, which alluded to in the Bishop's paper. Mr. Morris expressed an anxious desire to lay the whole matter before the Bishop. I was entirely opposed to it, as not authorized by the vestry, and for other reasons which he very well knew.

I proposed that he should submit them to the Rev. T. F. Davies, the rector of St. Peter's Church. I consented (seeing his determination) that they might also be laid before the Bishop. This decision, I remember, was said to Mr. Morris, "Read both papers to Mr. George N. Allen and Mr. Walter H. Tilden, and if they send them to the Bishop, then you may lay them before him."

I am aware that

MR. MORRIS CLAIMS

that no such declaration was made on my part. I simply ask, Why should I have requested that these papers be read to those two gentlemen if their counsel and advice were not to be asked in the matter?

I will pursue this matter no farther, save only to say that it was my wish that the papers should not go before the Bishop without the consent of both Messrs. Allen and Tilden. Mr. Allen I have not seen. Mr. Tilden has told me that he advised Mr. Morris not to present them to the Bishop, and that Mr. Morris gave him to understand that he would not send them.

But the papers did go. And they went without the knowledge or consent of the vestry.

THEY WENT IN SPITE

of the unanimous vote of the vestry against such reference. They went before the committee had made a report to the vestry, as they were directed to do. They went with no authority from anybody.

Let me here ask why, at a meeting of the vestry, at which I was unable to be present, Mr. Morris presented a report to the vestry, as they were directed to do? I was not consulted in the matter, nor had I any intimation that such was his intention.

As chairman of that committee, the report should have been presented first by me. Mr. Morris would afterwards have been entitled to present his paper, but not until then. The whole proceeding has been

UNPARLIAMENTARY

and irregular. I come now to

THE BISHOP'S PAPER.

The Bishop discusses, first, the subject of artificial confession.

In response to my statement that "the teaching of the American Church upon this subject is contained in 'Hooker's Ecclesiastical Polity'"; that "this book is one of the list prescribed by the House of Bishops, and by the

General Convention, for the study of every man previous to his ordination to the priesthood;" and that "having received the sanction and authority of the House of Bishops and General Convention, without any provisor or qualification, may be said fairly to speak the mind of the American Church."

The Bishop says:—"I need not point out the fallacy of the argument of Dr. Patterson, that because an author is mentioned in the list of books prescribed by the House of Bishops, to be read and studied by candidates for holy orders, that therefore, such author or work has the sanction and authority of the House of Bishops, and may be said fairly to represent the mind of the American Church; for it is too evident to escape notice."

So, then, the House of Bishops deliberately sets forth a list of books which they, in union with the General Convention, by canon require to be studied by candidates for holy orders, and yet "cannot thereby be said to give to such books their sanction and authority!"

THE "FALLACY" of this argument is "too evident to escape notice." The Bishop apparently proceeds upon the supposition that the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome is a "voluntary confession." He is mistaken. To no man is compulsory confession more abhorrent than to myself.

But, to the "troubled minds contemplated by the exhortation to the communion;" those with an "oppressed conscience" seek relief in that way, the Church has always counselled and encouraged confession as a means to "quiet the grief," and for the "removal of all scruple and doubtfulness."

The Bishop says in effect that the "whole drift" of Hooker's teaching is

AGAINST PRIVATE CONFESION.

What, then, is Hooker's meaning, when he says in Book vi, chap. lv, 7:—"Our Lord Jesus Christ hath left in His Church, \* \* \* spiritual and ghostly physicians, guides and pastors of redeemed souls, whose office doth not consist in general persuasions unto amendment of life, but also in the private particular cure of diseased minds."

The quotation from Bishop Jewel's "Apology" is entirely foreign to the subject.

Bishop Jewel speaking of the subject as taught and practised in the Church of Rome. When he speaks of the practice of the Church of England we get at his teaching on the subject under discussion.

IN THE HOMILY ON REPENTANCE.

In arguing against the compulsory confession of the Church of Rome, he says, "That every man should be bound to their (i. e. the Roman) artificial confession, it is no commandment or ordinance of God." So say I.

This same Bishop Jewel, in his defense of the Apology, says—"Touching the third (private) confession, made unto our brother, 'if it be discreetly used, to the greater comfort and better satisfaction of the penitent, without superstition or other ill, it is not in any wise by us reprov'd. The abuses and errors are not in the confession, but in the confession that is made to a private confessor than a private sermon."

The quotation from Bishop Jewel, used by Bishop Stevens, is foreign to the question under discussion. Used as he uses it, he makes Bishop Jewel say what he does not say.

THE BISHOP'S MEANING, for it is obvious that in either case the priest is to confess. For is not the priest to receive as well as the people? So then, in both cases, the "confession" is by priest and people. The Bishop's allusion to this rubric is to my mind utterly meaningless.

IN THIS DISCUSSION.

Again the Bishop says:—"Where the English rubric directs after this general confession, 'Then shall the priest (or the bishop being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, he shall pronounce the absolution, which rubric leaves out the words, 'pronounce absolution,' and substitutes the single word 'say.'"

Is there, then, no absolution? Are not the words which the priest is to say (the very same as those which he is to say) "I absolve thee, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen?"

DOES THE BISHOP INTEND here to say that the American Church conveys to her priesthood no power to "pronounce absolution" in the communion office?

What means she, then, when she uses the words which were used by the Bishop at my own ordination, and which she uses for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

ARE THESE WORDS A MOCKERY? Do they convey no power? No authority? Or, are they merely a high sounding phrase, repeated by the officiating minister, at the most solemn hour of his life?

The Bishop alludes to the omission in the American office for the visitation of the sick, of the particular and special confession, and absolution.

Why this was done, when we remember the Preface to the Prayer Book, heretofore mentioned, it is hard to explain, unless it be for the reason that the English office compels a confession, which the American office does not require.

Again he says:—"We enjoin private and particular confession, and the use of the confessional; and if any man do think that which is necessary for him on his death-bed, is necessary every time he comes to the Communion, and so come to such a confession, if any thing is upon his conscience, he may do so, if he will. We blame not, we dissuade not, we discount not that tenderness of conscience and that safe proceeding in the soul."

Wheatly on the Book of Common Prayer is very clear on this subject. His book is one of the list authorized by

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS and the General Convention. He says:—"No argument can be drawn, that because a practice has been abused, it should therefore be to be used. The abuses of it should be reformed, and not the practice discontinued."

"And therefore the Church of England at the Reformation freed it from all the encroachments with which the Church of Rome had embarrassed it, and reduced confession to its primitive plan."

Every one is left to his own discretion; all that was absolutely enjoined, was only a mutual forbearance and peace; for the security of which, a clause was added in the first book of King Edward, requiring such as shall be satisfied with a secret and learned minister, and with them that do so, to their farther satisfying, the articular and secret confession to the priest; and those also which think it needful and convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, upon their death-bed, to confess to the priest, to be absolved by him, when they are satisfied with their confessions to God, and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging of other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's word to the same."

"What could have been added more judiciously than this, to temper, on the one hand, the rigors of those who were too strict at that time; and on the other, to prevent, on the other hand, a carelessness in those who, being prejudiced against the abuse, were apt indiscriminately to reject the thing, as at no time needful or necessary to a man's soul."

So that we may still, I presume, wish, very consistently with the determination of our Church, that our people would apply themselves, oftener than they do, to their spiritual physicians, even in the time of their health, and since it is much to be feared, they are wounded oftener than they complain, and yet, through aversion to disclosing their sore, suffer it to gangrene for want of their help who should work the cure."

The exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles" by the Rt. Rev. Harold Browne, D. D., the present Bishop of Ely, is another of the books authorized by the House of Bishops and by the General Convention. The Bishop of Connecticut has edited an edition of the book for use in all our Divinity Schools. Bishop Browne says:—"The Church of England provides for all troubled consciences the power of relieving themselves, by making confession of guilt to their pastor, or to any other discreet and learned minister, and so give them comfort and counsel; but does not bind every one of necessity to release all his private sins to man, nor elevate such useful confession into a sacrament essential to salvation."

Page 887.

Many Luther says of private confession:—"It is useful, yea, necessary; neither would I desire that it had no existence, say rather, I rejoice that it exists in the Church of Christ." Again he says:—"I would rather lose a thousand worlds than suffer private confession to be thrust out of the Church."

I am unable to find a single word in the writings of Luther, Calvin, Ridley, Craumer, Hooker, or any of the Reformers against voluntary confession. They are almost unanimous on the subject of

COMPULSORY CONFESION, and equally unanimous on the subject of voluntary confession.

I have examined with patient care the writings of the great and good of the Anglican com-

munion, from the days of Ridley and Craumer to the present time, and at every step I find a condemnation of compulsory confession, and an equally strong commendation of voluntary confession.

The present Bishop of London—(Bishop Jackson) who cannot be said by anybody to be favorable to what is called the "Advanced School"—says, "As ministers should be, by their profession, usually the best advisers in cases of conscience, and are or ought to be every sentiment's ready and sympathizing friend; so to them the stricken or perplexed soul will often have recourse. Thus, there is a sense in which those dreaded words 'Confession to the Priest' may be expressed an edifying practice, and even at times a duty."

I may add, that in all the recent trials and troubles in the Church of England, in no instance has the subject of confession been touched, while it is well known that Keble, Bennett, Carter, Sadler, and hundreds of others of the English priesthood have been, or are, in the constant habit of hearing these voluntary confessions. The same statement is true in the case of many priests in the American Church.

The Bishop proceeds:—"Where the English Prayer Book in the first of the exhortations to the holy communion has the words, 'that by the ministry of God's Holy Word, he may receive such godly counsel and advice.'"

THE BENEFIT OF ABSOLUTION, together with ghostly counsel and advice, in the American Prayer Book the reference to absolution is left out, and the passage reads, 'that he may receive such godly counsel and advice.'

Does the Bishop mean by this paragraph to say that the American Church repudiates absolution? If so, I call your attention to the preface in her Prayer Book, where she says:—"This Church is far from intending to depart from the Church of England, in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship; or other than local circumstances require."

I CALL ATTENTION to the declaration which she puts in the mouth of every priest on all occasions of matins or evensong, viz: that "God hath given power" and "commandment to His ministers, to declare and pronounce, absolve, and remit their sins."

The Bishop goes on to say:—"Where the English rubric before the confession in the holy communion reads:—'Then shall the general confession be made in the name of all those that are minded to receive,' the American rubric says, 'Then shall this general confession be made by the priest and all those that are minded to receive, i. e., that the priest is to confess as well as the people.' I am at a loss to understand

THE BISHOP'S MEANING, for it is obvious that in either case the priest is to confess. For is not the priest to receive as well as the people? So then, in both cases, the "confession" is by priest and people. The Bishop's allusion to this rubric is to my mind utterly meaningless.

IN THIS DISCUSSION.

Again the Bishop says:—"Where the English rubric directs after this general confession, 'Then shall the priest (or the bishop being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, he shall pronounce the absolution, which rubric leaves out the words, 'pronounce absolution,' and substitutes the single word 'say.'"

Is there, then, no absolution? Are not the words which the priest is to say (the very same as those which he is to say) "I absolve thee, in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen?"

DOES THE BISHOP INTEND here to say that the American Church conveys to her priesthood no power to "pronounce absolution" in the communion office?

What means she, then, when she uses the words which were used by the Bishop at my own ordination, and which she uses for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of His Holy Sacraments: In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

ARE THESE WORDS A MOCKERY? Do they convey no power? No authority? Or, are they merely a high sounding phrase, repeated by the officiating minister, at the most solemn hour of his life?

The Bishop alludes to the omission in the American office for the visitation of the sick, of the particular and special confession, and absolution.

Why this was done, when we remember the Preface to the Prayer Book, heretofore mentioned, it is hard to explain, unless it be for the reason that the English office compels a confession, which the American office does not require.

Again he says:—"We enjoin private and particular confession, and the use of the confessional; and if any man do think that which is necessary for him on his death-bed, is necessary every time he comes to the Communion, and so come to such a confession, if any thing is upon his conscience, he may do so, if he will. We blame not, we dissuade not, we discount not that tenderness of conscience and that safe proceeding in the soul."

Wheatly on the Book of Common Prayer is very clear on this subject. His book is one of the list authorized by

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS and the General Convention. He says:—"No argument can be drawn, that because a practice has been abused, it should therefore be to be used. The abuses of it should be reformed, and not the practice discontinued."

"And therefore the Church of England at the Reformation freed it from all the encroachments with which the Church of Rome had embarrassed it, and reduced confession to its primitive plan."

Every one is left to his own discretion; all that was absolutely enjoined, was only a mutual forbearance and peace; for the security of which, a clause was added in the first book of King Edward, requiring such as shall be satisfied with a secret and learned minister, and with them that do so, to their farther satisfying, the articular and secret confession to the priest; and those also which think it needful and convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, upon their death-bed, to confess to the priest, to be absolved by him, when they are satisfied with their confessions to God, and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging of other men's minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God's word to the same."

"What could have been added more judiciously than this, to temper, on the one hand, the rigors of those who were too strict at that time; and on the other, to prevent, on the other hand, a carelessness in those who, being prejudiced against the abuse, were apt indiscriminately to reject the thing, as at no time needful or necessary to a man's soul."

So that we may still, I presume, wish, very consistently with the determination of our Church, that our people would apply themselves, oftener than they do, to their spiritual physicians, even in the time of their health, and since it is much to be feared, they are wounded oftener than they complain, and yet, through aversion to disclosing their sore, suffer it to gangrene for want of their help who should work the cure."

The exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles" by the Rt. Rev. Harold Browne, D. D., the present Bishop of Ely, is another of the books authorized by the House of Bishops and by the General Convention. The Bishop of Connecticut has edited an edition of the book for use in all our Divinity Schools. Bishop Browne says:—"The Church of England provides for all troubled consciences the power of relieving themselves, by making confession of guilt to their pastor, or to any other discreet and learned minister, and so give them comfort and counsel; but does not bind every one of necessity to release all his private sins to man, nor elevate such useful confession into a sacrament essential to salvation."

Page 887.

Many Luther says of private confession:—"It is useful, yea, necessary; neither would I desire that it had no existence, say rather, I rejoice that it exists in the Church of Christ." Again he says:—"I would rather lose a thousand worlds than suffer private confession to be thrust out of the Church."

I am unable to find a single word in the writings of Luther, Calvin, Ridley, Craumer, Hooker, or any of the Reformers against voluntary confession. They are almost unanimous on the subject of

COMPULSORY CONFESION, and equally unanimous on the subject of voluntary confession.

I have examined with patient care the writings of the great and good of the Anglican com-

hood an absolute, unqualified commission to do this very thing.

She restricts the newly-commissioned priest by no word or hint, in the use of the Divinely descended powers. If the "power and commandment" of God to "His ministers" to "declare and pronounce to His people, being penitent, the absolution and remission of their sins," be not a part of the office and work of a priest in the Church of God, what is it?

Beyond this the Bishop's whole argument is directed against the compulsory system of the Church of Rome, which system I abhor as deeply as it is possible for him to do.

THE BISHOP CONCLUDES this discussion by saying:—"I require the officiating ministers in St. Clement's parish to discontinue all teaching and practice which leads to or countenances such private confession or private absolution."

Are we to suppose the Bishop here to say that he will forbid the clergy of St. Clement's parish to hear a private confession, or to give absolution in such a case? If so, I am bold to say that he will do that which the Church nowhere gives him authority to do.

The American Church has given me authority without reserve, in this matter, and until she by her legislation shall take away that authority, I MUST USE MY LIBERTY.

This whole question touches the private duties of the priesthood. No subject can be more sacred. It is a matter outside the direction of a vestry; and one which, as a vestry, they have no right to interfere with. Whatever course every action of the ministry would be subject to the direction of a vestry. The same will apply to a Bishop.

The exhortation of the Communion bids the priest to keep in mind the priest and "open his grief." How that is to be done it is not the province of Bishop or layman to decide.

No men in the American Church have a higher "reverence for authority" than the clergy of St. Clement's parish. Men more deeply "loathe and abhor" anocracy.

Whatever the Bishop may command, counsel, or advise, within the limits of his rightful authority, shall, "with a glad mind, be reverently followed and obeyed" to the letter and in the spirit.

The question of "prayers for the dead" need not be discussed in this paper.

The vestry having unanimously declared that not one of them has ever heard say one word, in the pulpit or in the class, which they could not heartily endorse, it needs no words to prove that we are heartily in accord so far.

I DECLINE TO ACCEPT THE BISHOP'S DICTUM, that I am responsible for the sentiments expressed in the sermons of those who preach to me, and who are my peers, responsible not to me but to the diocesan authority under which they labor.

(What follows was not in the original paper. A more careful reading of the Bishop's paper seems to call for some examination.)

"The opinion that prayers for the dead are efficacious has never been 'taught or preached' in St. Clement's Church by anybody. To my knowledge the subject has never been alluded to more than once or twice. The Bishop says:—'"The two passages in the Prayer Book that are usually relied on by the advocates of this doctrine, are the prayer for the souls of the departed, and the prayer for the souls of the faithful departed, and in one of the prayers of the Burial Service.'"

The first sentence is, "And we also bless Thy Holy Name for Thy servants departed this life in Thy faith and charity, who are now in the Kingdom of God." The second is, "We beseech Thee, O Lord, to have mercy upon the souls of Thy Holy Name, who are now in the Kingdom of God."

The Bishop knows (or perhaps I should say, he ought to know) that this passage is not the one "relied on by the advocates of this doctrine." This passage is referred to, but the strong part of their argument lies in the prayer for the souls of the faithful departed, viz:—"And we earnestly desire Thy Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching Thee to grant that by the merits and death of Thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in His Blood, We, and all Thy Whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of His Passion."

The argument is, that "Thy Whole Church" comprises the Church of Christ, the Church of the Church Expectant, and the Church Triumphant. Therefore say they, the prayer reaches beyond those still in the flesh. The Bishop then alludes to the

PRAYER IN THE BURIAL OFFICE, and gives a quotation as follows:—"And we beseech Thee, O Lord, to have mercy upon the souls of those who are departed in the true faith of Thy Holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss in Thy eternal and everlasting glory. Way which the words 'Both in body and soul' are omitted? These are the very words upon which the "advocates of this doctrine" hang their whole argument. They say that the "perfect consummation and bliss" cannot be until the soul is reunited to the body; and that this is a supposition that the "bliss" of that day may be granted to those souls now separated from the body.

I now return to the original paper.

The remainder of the discussion is upon matters of ritual.

THIS WHOLE SUBJECT having been settled by the vestry, requires but little consideration. The vestry know full well that the rector is not strenuous upon these minor points, as (for the most part) they involve no principle.

He would probably differ from both Bishop and vestry in some points, but a man may do that without loss of confidence, trust, or affection. The question of

MIXING WATER WITH THE WINE, at the time of placing the oblations upon the altar, had been proposed to abandon if it was an offense to anybody, and it was unfair to take that question before the Bishop, especially as no person (in the vestry or out of it) had ever raised one word of objection to the practice.

In speaking of vestments, the Bishop says:—"There is no authority for the use of colored vestments in our Church, etc."

It is pretty generally known, I believe, that there is no authority for the use of any vestments in our Church, except that of common ecclesiastical law. God has not one word of law in our canon, nor has the American Church legislated upon the subject in any way, "directly or indirectly."

A BISHOP'S OPINION, however wise, learned, or pious he may be, surely cannot be elevated to the position of law.

The Bishop of New York, in his recent action, took good care to recommend, not to command; nor did he touch the question of colored stoles. He simply requested the clergy who had used the colored chasuble to substitute white in place of it.

The use of the colored stoles the rector and vestry agreed should be continued, and await the action of the next General Convention.

Not one member of the vestry raised a word of objection, nor to the use of them.

The Bishop concludes his paper by saying:—"It would certainly be a mockery of Episcopal authority, and bad faith towards the vestry of St. Clement's Church, after agreeing to submit the controversy to the vestry, and after having agreed to 'submit the controversy to the ordinary.'"

On the contrary, the rector has steadily protested against it; and the vestry by an unanimous vote, on the 11th of January, decided not to do it.

IT HAS BEEN THE AIM of the majority of the vestry to settle the matter among themselves without such a reference. This was the reason for the appointment of a committee to report upon the subject. But Mr. Morris, in his haste, has rushed the question before the ordinary, with no authority whatsoever, and has placed the ordinary in a false position by giving him to understand that the matter was referred to him for adjudication, which was not the case. Had Mr. Morris come to me before the introduction of his first resolution, all the painful discussions which have fol-

lowed might have been avoided. The clergy of St. Clement's

STATED THEIR REPUTATION upon their work there, believing in the truth and good faith of the vestry. The work has been a triumph success, but this action may result in defeat and disaster, not in dishonor. The whole congregation, with not more